

DEC 28 2007

CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FREDDIE FLETCHER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SIR ARTHUR GILBERT, Deceased, sued
as the Arthur and Rosalind Gilbert 1982
Trust; et al.,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 06-56825

D.C. No. CV-06-05048-SJO

MEMORANDUM^{*}

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
S. James Otero, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 20, 2007^{**}

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and HAWKINS, Circuit Judges.

Freddie Fletcher, an attorney, appeals pro se from the district court's
judgment dismissing for lack of subject matter jurisdiction his action under 42

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

U.S.C. § 1983 challenging on constitutional grounds a final judgment rendered against him by the California Supreme Court. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court’s jurisdictional dismissal based on the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. *Noel v. Hall*, 341 F.3d 1148, 1154 (9th Cir. 2003). We affirm.

Fletcher contends that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine should not apply because the state court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and rendered a void judgment. We disagree. *See Doe v. Mann*, 415 F.3d 1038, 1043 n.6 (9th Cir. 2005) (“*Rooker-Feldman* applies where the plaintiff in federal court claims that the state court did not have jurisdiction to render a judgment.”). The district court properly concluded that the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine barred Fletcher’s action because it is a “forbidden de facto appeal from a judicial decision of a state court,” and raises constitutional claims that are “inextricably intertwined” with that prior state court decision. *Noel*, 341 F.3d. at 1158.

AFFIRMED.